



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,050	07/24/2003	Brent L. Davis	BOC9-2003-0005 (374)	1446
40987 7590 11/19/2008 AKERMAN SENTERFITT P. O. BOX 3188 WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33402-3188				
EXAMINER				
LERNER, MARTIN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2626				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/19/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/626,050

Applicant(s)

DAVIS ET AL.

Examiner

MARTIN LERNER

Art Unit

2626

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 October 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 to 2 and 4 to 6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 to 2 and 4 to 6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-85/86)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 08/27/08
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 to 2 and 4 to 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Moore et al.* ('041) in view of *Yu et al.*

Concerning independent claim 1, *Moore et al.* ('041) discloses a method for responding to messages, comprising:

"providing a speech processing device serving as a bridge between said teleconferencing system and said messaging system, the speech processing device being directly coupled between the teleconferencing system and the instant messaging system or coupled between the teleconferencing system and the instant messaging system via a data network, the speech processing device being configured to convert a speech input into a text message or a text message into a speech output" – intelligent media translator (IMT) 70 ("a speech processing device") receives speech signals, and a speech-to-text conversion process converts the received speech signals into corresponding textual information to provide the textual information ultimately to a messaging client, receives textual information, and a text-to-speech conversion process

converts the received textual information into corresponding speech signals (Page 10: ¶[0104]: Figure 1); service provider system 30 may include, without limitation, conference call establishment (Page 7: ¶[0087]); thus, service provider system 30 is equivalent to "said teleconferencing system"; instant messaging (IM) service 22 ("the instant messaging system") communicates instant messages through chat client 14 so that text instant messages can be exchanged in real time with one or more parties (Page 7, ¶[0077]- ¶[0082]: Figure 1);

"receiving at said speech processing device a speech input received by said teleconferencing system from a telephone connected to the teleconferencing system" – speech information from a caller using telephone 62 is carried through PSTN 60, and is directed to speech-to-text module 74 through service provider system 30 ("said teleconferencing system") via line 80 (Page 10, ¶[0118]: Figure 1);

"transcribing the speech into a first text message by the speech processing device" – the packetized data stream is directed to speech-to-text module 74 of intelligent media translator 70 ("the speech processing device") to convert the received speech signals into a textual representation (Page 10: ¶[0105]: Figure 1);

"transmitting the first text message to a plurality of instant messaging devices participating in an instant messaging based conference managed by the instant messaging system" – the textual information may then be sent to a text chat interface of chat client 14, perhaps in the form of a typical chat message, via network 20 and perhaps involving IM service 22; an optional instant messaging sender 79a is depicted along connection 76 representing adaptation of the speech-to-text module 74 to carry

on instant communications with chat client 14 (Page 10: ¶[0105]; Figure 1); a chat client 14 supports communications with one or more principals, and instant messaging through which text messages can be exchanged in real time with one or more other parties ("to a plurality of instant messaging devices participating in an instant messaging based conference") (Page 6: ¶[0075], Page 7: ¶[0082]);

"receiving at the speech processing device a second text message from any one among the plurality of instant messaging devices participating in the instant messaging based conference" – intelligent media translator (IMT) 70 may comprise a port for receiving textual information from a messaging client (Page 10: ¶[0104]; Figure 1); chat client 14 may be implemented by or based upon well known instant messaging (Page 6, ¶[0075]; Figure 1);

"converting the second text message to a speech output" – intelligent media translator 70 comprises a text-to-speech conversion process for converting the received textual information into corresponding speech signals via a text-to-speech module 72 (Page 10: ¶[0103] - ¶[0104]; Figure 1);

"transmitting the speech output to a plurality of telephones participating in a teleconference managed by the teleconferencing system" – speech signals are sent through a communications medium, such as a telephone connection or RTP session, to a chat client 14 or telephone 62 (Page 10: ¶[0103] - ¶[0104]; Figure 1); telephone 62 is connected through service provider 30; service provider system 30 may include, without limitation, conference call establishment (Page 7: ¶[0087]); thus, service provider system 30 is equivalent to "said teleconferencing system", which transmits

teleconferencing calls through PSTN 60 to telephone 62, or to IP telephone 92 through VoIP gateway 54.

Concerning independent claim 1, the only element not expressly disclosed by *Moore et al.* ('041) is a speech processing device "serving as a bridge between said teleconferencing system and said messaging system, the device being directly coupled between the teleconferencing system and the instant messaging system or coupled between the teleconferencing system and the instant messaging system via a data network". *Moore et al.* ('041) discloses all of a speech processing device being configured to convert a speech input into a text message or a text message into speech, a teleconferencing system, and an instant messaging system, but may connect, or couple, them in a somewhat different way, insofar as intelligent media translator 70 ("a speech processing device") is coupled to service provider system 30 ("said teleconferencing system") via line 80, and intelligent chat gateway 50 ("said teleconferencing system") is coupled to IM service 22 ("said instant messaging system") via line 86, but intelligent media translator 70 ("a speech processing system") is not clearly directly coupled to IM service 22 ("said instant messaging system"), and thereby does not serve as a bridge between the teleconferencing system and the messaging system. However, it is maintained that, in an absence of unexpected advantages, it is immaterial, and a question only of 'design choice', as to how all of the systems and subsystems are coupled together, and what is connected to what, as it is well known

that functionalities may be distributed in an arbitrary manner within communication networks.

Concerning independent claim 1, moreover, *Yu et al.* teaches a method for wireless instant messaging, where a mobile station (MS), such as a cellular telephone, may be registered with an instant messaging (IM) server as being available to receive instant messages via an IM proxy. (Abstract) Exemplary IM client terminals 64, 66 are shown as personal computers. An IM server 68 coordinates or facilitates instant messaging between IM client terminals 64, 66. (Column 10, Lines 47 to 65: Figure 6) When mobile station (MS) 80 sends an instant message destined for an IM client, service node (SN) 70 receives the message, converts it to a form suitable for transmission to the destination IM client, and transmits the message to the destination IM client. (Column 12, Lines 49 to 57: Figure 6) SN 70 preferably includes IVRU (intelligent voice response unit) 100 functionality and text/speech conversion functionality represented by blocks 100 and 102. Text/speech converter 102 allows SN 70 to convert between text messages and speech signals. (Column 13, Lines 23 to 46: Figure 7) Thus, SN 70 includes a functionality of "a speech processing device". Furthermore, *Yu et al.* says that, while communication has focused on communication of instant messages between a pair of users, communication could be facilitated to extend between three or more parties at once, thereby providing for real-time conferencing. To provide the functionality, a service node (SN) could serve as a conference bridge, maintaining a record of the parties to a conference and then multicasting instant messages between the conference participants. (Column 21, Line

62 to Column 22, Line 4) Thus, *Yu et al.* suggests "a teleconferencing system" at service node 70. Given that *Yu et al.* suggests both IVRU 100/text-to-speech converter 102 and a teleconferencing bridge are placed at a service node 70, then IVRU 100/text-to-speech converter 102 ("the speech processing device") is configured "serving as a bridge between" a conferencing bridge ("the teleconferencing system") and IM server 68 ("the instant messaging system"), and is "coupled directed between" them, insofar as IVRU 100/text-to-speech converter 102 is directly coupled to a conference bridge within a service node 70. *Yu et al.* teaches an objective of providing an instant messaging service in a wireless domain. (Column 7, Lines 39 to 50) It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to utilize an architecture where an intelligent voice response unit and text/speech conversion device is coupled directly between a teleconferencing system and an instant messaging system as taught by *Yu et al.* in a message response system of *Moore et al.* ('041) for a purpose of providing an instant message service in a wireless domain.

Concerning claim 2, *Moore et al.* ('041) discloses a profile is maintained for a given user as a preference as to how synthesized speech presented to him is rendered ("personalized voice output at the telephones"); aspects of speech rendering include whether a male or female voice is preferred, approximate speaker age, vocal characteristics, inflection, and local dialect ("a simulated voice print of the user") (¶[0113] : Figure 1).

Concerning claims 4 and 5, *Moore et al.* ('041) discloses that in the course of converting speech and other audible signals into corresponding symbols or text, IMT 70 may also perform translation among different spoken and written languages, for example, converting English text to Spanish speech and vice-versa; language preferences or compatibilities of one or both of the parties may be known or maintained in a profile database or expressed by devices ("is specified by a profile associated with said identified user"); implicitly, a user is identified in order to be associated with a profile ("identifying a user associated with said telephone"). (Page 11: ¶[0112])

Concerning claim 6, *Moore et al.* ('041) discloses that, after the packetized data stream is converted into a textual representation by speech-to-text module 74, the textual information is then sent via network 20 ("transmitting a text stream"). (Page 10: ¶[0105]; Figure 1)

Response to Arguments

3. Applicants' arguments filed 02 October 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Firstly, Applicants state that *Moore et al.* ('041) discloses only an instant messaging system which can be accessed by an IP phone or a traditional phone (not connected to any teleconferencing system), and not a system bridging an instant messaging system and a teleconferencing system. Applicants maintain that the data processing system 12 (chat client), the communications network 20, and the service

provider system 30 (providing chat-based services) are all part of the instant messaging system. This argument is traversed.

Moore et al. ('041) discloses an IM service 22, which is being construed as the claimed instant messaging system. IM service 22 provides instant messaging services to chat client 14, telephones 62, and IP telephones 92. Moreover, IM service 22 is shown to reside on network 20 in Figure 1. Thus, it is not agreed that chat client 14, communication network 20, and service provider system 30 need to be read as all part of the instant messaging system for purposes of construing independent claim 1. IP telephone 92 could place a telephone call to conventional telephone 62 through network 20, where that telephone call involves no instant messaging.

Secondly, Applicants argue that *Moore et al. ('041)* discloses a communication system 10 can also include a gateway system 50 coupled to network 20 or to service provider system 30. However, Applicants' continue to maintain that intelligent chat gateway 52 is not a teleconferencing system in the sense of the invention, but only serves as an interface between instant messaging service provider system 30 and gateway system 50. This position is traversed.

Intelligent chat gateway 52 does more than serve only as an interface between the instant messaging service provider system and the gateway system 50. Gateway system 50 includes VoIP gateway 54, so that IP telephone 92 can place a telephone call to conventional telephone 62 through PSTN 60. Similarly, a telephone call from telephone 62 could be routed through PSTN 60 and gateway system 50 onto a billing system 42, and to an automated respondent 36 or a human respondent 34 of service

provider system 30. Service provider system 30 is disclosed to include functions of directory assistance, call completion, conference call establishment, customer support, concierge services, and other services traditionally provided by telephony operator services provider. See ¶[0087].

Thirdly, Applicants argue that if the service provider system 30 is considered as a teleconferencing system, then there is no separate instant messaging system and teleconferencing system in the communication system 10 because the service provider system is an instant messaging system service provider system that provides chat-based services. This argument is fallacious.

Moore et al. ('041) discloses that service provider system 30 includes functions of directory assistance, call completion, conference call establishment, customer support, concierge services, and other services traditionally provided by telephony operator services provider. See ¶[0087]. Thus, if Applicants wish to find a precise location for a teleconferencing system, then it can be clearly found to reside within service provider system 30, as service provider system 30 is expressly disclosed to include conference call establishment, which is a service traditionally provided by telephony operators. Applicants' argument that service provider 30 is part of the instant messaging system, and cannot be considered as a separate element in its own right, does not make sense: IM (instant messaging) service 22 is Applicants' claimed instant messaging system, and resides on network 20.

Indeed, *Moore et al. ('041)* discloses a network topology in Figure 1 that can be understood to anticipate the limitation of "providing a speech processing device serving

as a bridge between said teleconferencing system and said messaging system".

Intelligent media translator 70 ("a speech processing device") is shown to connect through control 73 and line 80 to service provider system 30 ("said teleconferencing system") and through lines 75 and 78 to gateway system 50. In turn, gateway system 50 connects to IM service 22 ("said instant messaging system") through line 86 of intelligent chat gateway 52. Thus, intelligent media translator 70 ("a speech processing device" serves as a bridge between service provider system 30 ("said teleconferencing system") and IM service 22 ("said instant messaging system"); that is, intelligent media translator 70 is connected to service provider system 30 ("said teleconferencing system") and to IM service 22 ("said instant messaging system") through intelligent chat gateway 52. Then, conventional telephone 62 may set up a conference call with IP telephone 92 through functionality provided by service provider system 30; service provider system 30 may utilize the media translation services of intelligent media translator 70 through line 80, and intelligent media translator 70 sends text through gateway 50 to IM service 22, and on to chat client 14. It follows that IMT 70 is an intermediary, or "bridge", between service provider system 30 providing conference call establishment functionality and IM service 22 providing an instant messaging system.

Finally, Applicants argue that *Yu et al.* teaches a method of IM communication between a cellular phone user and a user of an IM system, but that a cellular phone cannot be compared with a teleconferencing system. Applicants note that *Yu et al.* mentions that communication can be facilitated between three or more parties, but *Yu et*

al. does not disclose the concept of bridging an existing IM system and an existing teleconferencing system. This is not persuasive.

It is agreed that *Yu et al.* only teaches a conference bridge between parties for instant messaging and not standard teleconferencing. However, *Yu et al.* is being cited as a suggestion for varying a communications architectural arrangement so as to simply put the teleconferencing system of *Moore et al.* ('041) at a different location in the network. *Moore et al.* ('041) already discloses the teleconferencing system. At most, the only teaching required by *Yu et al.* is to vary the location of an existing component. Basically, moreover, Applicants are arguing the individual features of the references without duly considering what is suggested by the combination. One cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Therefore, the rejection of claims 1 to 2 and 4 to 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Moore et al.* ('041) in view of *Yu et al.* is proper.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicants are reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Martin Lerner whose telephone number is (571) 272-7608. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM Monday to Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David R. Hudspeth can be reached on (571) 272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 2626

If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Martin Lerner/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2626
November 13, 2008